

Serial No. 10/781,786

Docket No.: 300.1145

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and abstract have been amended for improved clarity and without change of substance and further various of the original filed claims 1-8 have been amended to improve clarity and without change of substance and new claims 9-13 have been added.

No new matter is presented.

Approval and entry of the foregoing amended specification, abstract and new independent claims are respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 1 FOR ANTICIPATION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(E) BY KHANDROS ET AL. (U.S. PATENT 6,442,831)

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 4-7 FOR ANTICIPATION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) BY CHANG ET AL. (U.S. PATNET 6,168,974)

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 2 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) OVER KHANDROS ET AL. (U.S. PATENT 6,442,831) IN VIEW OF LEE ET AL. (U.S. PATENT 6,469,386)**REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3, 5 AND 6 AT PAGES 4-5 OF THE ACTION FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) OVER KHANDROS AND LEE ET AL. TAKEN FURTHER WITH CHUA ET AL. (U.S. PATENT 6,439,898)**

The rejections are respectfully traversed.

According to the present invention, in order to effectively remove any contamination attached to the external contact terminal of a semiconductor device, the external contact terminal is plated alternately, i.e., successively, with a plurality of layers including a first layer, which can be etched by first etching agent but cannot be etched by second etching agent, and a second layer, which can be etched by the second etching agent, but cannot be etched by the first etching agent, as defined by independent claims 1 and 4. (The amendments to claims 1 and 4 are fully supported by the description, such as from page 9, line 10 to page 10, line 14.)

Therefore, as claimed in independent method claim 8 (allowed) and newly added independent claim 10, if the surface of the external contact terminal is contaminated, the plated

Serial No. 10/781,786

Docket No.: 300.1145

layer can be removed by an etching treatment in accordance with a degree of contamination. In this case, for example, the first outermost layer is dissolved by a first etching agent so that any contamination attached to the external contact terminal is removed with the outermost layer. However, the second layer is not reactive to the first etching agent and remains as a new outermost layer of the external contact terminal, so that the contact electrical resistance of the external contact terminal can always be maintained at low level.

New dependent claims 11-13 address further features of the method wherein each of successive, next-outermost layers may be removed, in a number sufficient to remove a contaminate, and, at some selective stage of removal of the plated layers (i.e., after a selected number or all of the plated layers have been removed) successive layers may be successively and alternatively plated, again, on the external contact terminals to enable reuse thereof.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1 AND CLAIMS 4 AND 7, RESPECTIVELY FOR ANTICIPATION BY KHANDROS ET AL. AND CHANG ET AL.

Khandros et al. (U.S. Patent 6, 442, 831) and Chang et al. (U.S. Patent 6,168,974) merely disclose spring wires coated with a plated layer. They do not disclose a multiple-layer plated film, including particular material which can be dissolved by a particular etching agent, but not reactive to another etching agent. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1, 4 and 7 are not anticipated by either of Khandros et al. or Chang et al.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 2, 3, 5, AND 6 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) OVER KHANDROS OR CHANG ET AL. IN VIEW, VARIOUSLY, OF LEE ET AL. AND CHUA ET AL.

Khandros et al. and Chang et al. are distinguished on the grounds set forth hereinabove.

Lee et al. (U.S. Patent 6,469,386) discloses a lead frame coated with a plated layer, but is unrelated to external connecting terminals. Also, Lee et al. does not disclose any special structure of the plated layers as in the claimed invention. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 2, 3 and 5 would not be obvious over Khandros et al. or Chang et al. in view of Lee et al.

Chua et al. (US 6,439,898 B2) only discloses a connecting terminal, but makes no suggestion of any structure of special plated layers, as in the claimed invention. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 6 would not be obvious over either of Khandros et al. and Chang et al., taken in view of Chua et al.

Accordingly, it is submitted that none of the rejections for obviousness is supported based on the disclosures of the references.

Serial No. 10/781,786

Docket No.: 300.1145

Furthermore, it is submitted that no *prima facie* demonstration of obviousness has been provided in support of any of the combinations relied upon, meeting the stringent standards of MPEP 2143-2143.03.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the references and rejections of record and, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: January 21, 2005By: 

H. J. Staas

Registration No. 22,010

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 1-21, 2005

STAAS & HALSEY

By: Date 1-21-05